DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 600 IR 052 094

AUTHOR Turner, Carol; Latta, Ann
TITLE Current Approaches to Improving Access to Government Documents.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-918006-54-6
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 49p.; An OMS Occasional Paper Produced as part of the Collaborative Research-Writing Program.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036 (OP12, $15.00, pre-payment required).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Access to Information; Case Studies; *Cataloging; *Depository Libraries; *Government Publications; Higher Education; Indexes; Library Catalogs; Library Surveys; Questionnaires; *Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *Association of Research Libraries; Government Printing Office; MARC; Retrospective Conversion (Library Catalogs)

ABSTRACT

Based on the responses of 77 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries to a December 1986 survey of 106 ARL libraries (a 73% response rate), this report profiles the current state of bibliographic access to federal publications. Following a brief discussion of survey background and methodology, a summary of survey results indicates that the typical respondent became a depository in 1912, selects 80% of the items offered on deposit, and maintains a centralized U.S. document collection. In addition, issues and needs for bibliographic access are identified, and case studies are presented for the following approaches to access: (1) the shelflist and printed indexes (Dartmouth College); (2) traditional cataloging (Pennsylvania State University and Cornell University); (3) loading the GPO (Government Printing Office) tapes (New York State Library, the University of Florida, Rice University, and Texas A&M University); and (4) retrospective conversion (Case Western Reserve University, the University of Cincinnati, Cornell University, the University of California at Los Angeles, and the University of California at Irvine). Finally, options and recommendations are presented for future action by individual libraries and cooperative programs. A federal depository collection profile and approaches to bibliographic access to U.S. federal government publications are presented in two tables. A 12-item selected bibliography and the survey form are also provided. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285600

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CURRENT APPROACHES TO IMPROVING ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

AN OMS OCCASIONAL PAPER
PRODUCED AS PART OF THE
COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH-WRITING PROGRAM

JUNE 1987

Association of Research Libraries
Office of Management Studies
Washington, D.C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR053094

CURRENT APPROACHES TO IMPROVING ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

AN OMS OCCASIONAL PAPER

PRODUCED AS PART OF THE

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH-WRITING PROGRAM

Carol Turner
University of Florida Libraries

and

Ann Latta
Stanford University Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Office of Management Studies
Washington, D.C.

June 1987

Current Approaches to Improving Access to Government Documents

is published by the
Office of Management Studies
Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

PRICE: $15.00

Order by title and publication number: OP12.
Prepayment is required, with check made payable to:
"ARL Office of Management Studies"

COPYRIGHT 1987 BY
THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

Requests for reproduction in whole or part
for noncommercial purposes of educational advancement
are permitted, providing proper acknowledgement is made.

ISBN 0-918006-54-6

Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 2

SURVEY METHODOLOGY 3

SUMMARY OF RESULTS 4

TABLE 1: Federal Depository Collection Profile, Respondent ARL Libraries 5

TABLE 2: Bibliographic Access to U.S. Federal Government Publications 10

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS ISSUES AND NEEDS 18

ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR PROVIDING ACCESS 21

THE SHELFLIST AND PRINTED INDEXES 21

CASE STUDIES
Dartmouth 21

TRADITIONAL CATALOGING 23

CASE STUDIES
Pennsylvania State 24
Cornell, Olin Library 26

LOADING THE GPO TAPES 28

CASE STUDIES
New York State Library 29
University of Florida 30
Rice University and Texas A&M 32

RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION 33

CASE STUDIES
Case Western Reserve 33
University of Cincinnati 34
Cornell, Olin Library 34
University of California, Los Angeles and Irvine 35

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 37

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 40

SPEC SURVEY FORM 41

CURRENT APPROACHES TO IMPROVING ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

U.S. federal government publications continue to be less bibliographically accessible than other materials in most research libraries. The opportunities provided by automation, coupled with concerns about the decreasing availability of government information from federal sources, have prompted document librarians to step-up their efforts to enhance access. The Government Printing Office's machine-readable computer tapes offer one solution to traditionally limited access. Some libraries are using the records on OCLC or RLIN for copy cataloging, while others are purchasing the GPO tapes and loading them into local databases. However, less is being done with either method than anticipated. There is also a dearth of retrospective conversion for uncataloged document collections. And few cooperative efforts are being undertaken in any sphere.

Despite the current low level of activity, there are several possibilities for enabling federal publications to have local bibliographic parity with other material. There is strong support for cleaning up the GPO tapes and considerable interest in making bibliographic records for retrospective materials readily available. It is clear that this must be achieved in a manner that is cost-effective. The approach each library will take to improving access is dependent on the existing bibliographic situation and on the availability of funding. No single approach will work in all libraries.

This paper, based on a survey of 106 Association of Research Libraries members, profiles the current state of bibliographic access to federal publications and presents 12 short case studies of libraries' approaches to providing access through: the shelflist and printed indexes, traditional cataloging, loading the GPO tapes, and retrospective conversion. Its conclusion provides options and recommendations for future action by individual libraries and cooperative programs. A selected bibliography is provided.

BACKGROUND

Providing users with sufficient bibliographic access to publications of the U.S. federal government is and has long been a major concern of document librarians in research libraries. The federal government is frequently the sole source of information essential to research in a wide range of subject areas, yet in many areas traditional methods of disseminating this information to the public are being reduced. At the same time, automation offers new possibilities for improving user access to federal documents.

Research libraries continue to recognize the value of U.S. government publications and have acquired substantial collections of them, primarily through participation in the federal depository library program. However, most research libraries have not been able to give government publications the same level of bibliographic control as they've given other materials in their collections. As a result, bibliographic access has been limited, and a valuable resource has been underutilized.

Lack of access has been justified by the perceived difficulty of handling this material locally, coupled with the availability of indexing from the Government Printing Office. (GPO indexes, unfortunately, are not integrated with a library's central catalog.) A more compelling reason has been the cost to individual libraries of providing standard bibliographic access to this very large body of material (about 25,000 Monthly Catalog entries per year or about 12,000 new records for monographs and analytics if recurring serial titles are omitted).

However, the advent of automation, and especially the availability of the Government Printing Office's machine-readable computer tapes of the Monthly Catalog beginning in 1976, has made it possible to challenge continuation of traditionally limited access. In addition, as the federal government reduces its channels of information access due to budget constraints, there is a greater need for research libraries to enhance their role in providing users with this material.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey on which this paper is based asked for data on the current state of bibliographic access to U.S. federal government publications in Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members. As document librarians who were attempting to bring U.S. federal documents into the bibliographic mainstream in a research library, the researchers were interested in learning how others were approaching this challenge -- what avenues they followed, what problems they encountered, what results were achieved, and whether many libraries were utilizing new technologies to enhance access to U.S. documents. A major objective was identifying techniques that could be shared and candidates for cooperative efforts.

The survey was initially drafted, critiqued by colleagues in the Stanford University Libraries, and tested by three other document librarians in California. Authors then discussed it with ARL staff and developed a test survey that was sent to nine ARL libraries. Comments from these libraries were reviewed, and appropriate changes were made in the final survey and cover letter. The survey was mailed to 106 U.S. ARL libraries in December, 1986, with responses requested by January 31, 1987. (The survey is reproduced at the end of this paper.)

On January 18, 1987, ARL staff member Jaia Barrett and Carol Turner held a meeting for interested persons in conjunction with the ALA midwinter meeting in order to discuss the survey, gather suggestions on the kind of final product that would be useful, and allow people to submit completed surveys in person. About 12 librarians attended, and a discussion of issues proved useful in helping shape this publication. As surveys were returned, specific follow-up letters were sent requesting clarification or additional information, and follow-up letters were sent to libraries that had not responded.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Of the 106 members of ARL which received the survey, 77 libraries, or 73% of the total, responded. All but one of the libraries collect U.S. federal documents. All but two are depository libraries. The typical respondent became a depository in 1912, currently selected 80% of the items offered on deposit, and maintains a centralized U.S. document collection. (See Table 1). The typical library provides access to its collection through a brief inhouse record, usually a departmental shelflist. Some serials and very few monographs are fully cataloged.

In some libraries, federal documents were once fully cataloged but are no longer and there has, in fact, been a degradation in the level of bibliographic control. At the same time, the availability of the Government Printing Office tapes and the undertaking of retrospective conversion projects in many libraries are offering opportunities for better access. In cases where documents have been fully cataloged, documents are likely to be included in retrospective conversion (recon) projects and records will be provided to OCLC or RLIN. In libraries with separate uncataloged U.S. government publications collections, document recon projects are seldom undertaken and the GPO tapes are viewed as an attractive means to bring U.S. documents into the local bibliographic mainstream. Few records from these libraries' document collections appear in OCLC or RLIN (See Table 2).

TABLE 1

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY COLLECTION PROFILE
RESPONDENT ARL LIBRARIES

Institution	Date of Depository Designation	Percentage of Depository Items Selected	Centralized or Decentralized Collection*
Alabama	1860	100%	Centralized
Arizona	1907	100%	Centralized
Arizona State	1944	95%	Centralized
Brigham Young	1901	80%	Centralized
Brown	1900?	48%	Centralized
Calif.-Berkeley	1907	85%	Centralized
Calif.-Irvine	1965	60%	Centralized
Calif.-Los Angeles	1932	67%	Centralized
Calif.-San Diego	1963	90%	Centralized
Calif.-Santa Barbara	1960	80%	Centralized
Case Western Reserve	1913	50%	Centralized
Chicago	1897	80%	Decentralized
Cincinnati	1929	92%	Centralized 1970
Colorado State	1907	94%	Centralized
Columbia	1882	70%	Centralized 1976

* Centralized Collection = a separate documents department or library
Decentralized Collection = integration of federal documents into main library and/or branch collections

Institution	Date of Depository Designation	Percentage of Depository Items Selected	Centralized or Decentralized Collection
Cornell	1907	55%	Decentralized
Dartmouth	1884	80%	Centralized 1979
Emory	1928	55%	Centralized
Florida	1907	100%	Centralized
Georgia	1907	100%	Centralized
Georgia Tech	1964	88%	Centralized
Georgetown	1969	46%	Centralized
Howard	Varies by Library	80%	Decentralized
Hawaii	1907	100%	Centralized
Illinois	1907	95%	Centralized 1980
Indiana	1881	N.A.	Centralized
Iowa	1884	100%	Centralized
Iowa State	1907	79.8%	Centralized
Kansas	1868	100%	Centralized
Kent State	1962	77%	Centralized

Institution	Date of Depository Designation	Percentage of Depository Items Selected	Centralized or Decentralized Collection
Kentucky	1907	100%	Centralized
Linda Hall	1938	N.A.	Centralized
Louisiana State	1907	100%	Centralized
Maryland	1925	100%	Centralized
Massachusetts	1906	86%	Centralized
MIT	1946	40-50%	Decentralized
Miami	1939	90%	Centralized
Michigan	1884	85%	Decentralized
Michigan State	1907	97%	Centralized
Minnesota	1907	100%	Centralized
Missouri	1862	100%	Centralized
New York Public Library	1884	85%	Centralized
New York State Library-Cultural Education Center	1845	100%	Centralized 1985
New York University	1967	55%	Centralized
North Carolina	1884	100%	Centralized
North Carolina State	1923	88%	Centralized

Institution	Date of Depository Designation	Percentage of Depository Items Selected	Centralized or Decentralized Collection
Northwestern	1876	82%	Centralized
Notre Dame	1884	64%	Centralized
Ohio State	1907	67%	Decentralized
Oregon	1884	85%	Centralized
Pennsylvania State	1907	83%	Centralized
Pittsburgh	1910	69.5%	Centralized
Princeton	1884	35%	Centralized 1979
Purdue	1907	90%	Decentralized
Rice	1968	33%	Centralized
Rochester	1880	72%	Centralized
Rutgers	1907	93%	Centralized
Southern Illinois	1932	90%	Centralized
Stanford	1895	75%	Centralized
SUNY-Albany	1964	54%	Centralized
SUNY-Buffalo	1963	92%	Centralized
Syracuse	1878	66.53%	Centralized
Temple	1947	65%	Centralized

Institution	Date of Depository Designation	Percentage of Depository Items Selected	Centralized or Decentralized Collection
Tennessee	1907	81%	Centralized
Texas	1884	76%	Decentralized
Texas, A&M	1907	89%	Centralized
Virginia	1910	100%	Centralized
Virginia Polytechnic	1907	79%	Centralized
Washington	1890	85%	50% Decentralized 50% Centralized
Washington State	1907	67%	Centralized
Washington University St. Louis	1906	55%	Centralized
Wayne State	1937	54%	Centralized
Wisconsin	1939	33%	Decentralized
Yale	1859	65%	Centralized

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO U.S. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Key: A - Shelflist or other form of brief in-house record
B - Full AACR cataloging

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Alabama	A	3% of current publications and 7% of retrospective publications on OCLC
Arizona	A	1% of publications on OCLC
Arizona State	A	Less than 1% of all publications on OCLC
Brigham Young	Current publications - B Retrospective publications - A	10% of retrospective monographs and and 75% of retrospective serials on RLIN
Brown	A	Some publications on RLIN 98% of current monographs on OCLC and RLIN, large # of retrospective monographs on OCLC and RLIN via REMARC RECON project. 100% of serials on RLIN
Calif., Berkeley	B	98% of current monographs on OCLC and RLIN, large # of retrospective monographs on OCLC and RLIN via REMARC RECON project. 100% of serials on RLIN
Calif., Davis	A	Very few records on RLIN
Calif., Irvine	A	No national records reported
Calif., Los Angeles	Current publns.- in process level records. Retrospective publns. - A	20% of monographs on OCLC. 85% of current serials and 60% of serials since 1977 on OCLC. RECON projects are adding all fully cataloged titles and those with OCLC copy to OCLC.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Calif., San Diego	A	Very few records on OCLC
Calif., Santa Barbara	A	Very few records on OCLC or RLIN
Case Western Reserve	B	90% of current publications and 50% of retrospective publications on OCLC. Converting are records from 1970 using OCLC microcon
Chicago	B	10% of current monographs, 1% of retrospective monographs and 1% of all serials on OCLC
Cincinatti	A	Records from 1985 Monthly Catalog periodicals supplement on OCLC
Colorado	A	Very few records on OCLC
Colorado State	A	1% of current publications and 11,000 retrospective monographs and 100 retrospective serials on OCLC and RLIN
Columbia	Current publications - A Pre-1976 publications - B	5% of publications on RLIN
Connecticut	A	10% of publications on OCLC
Cornell	B	90% of current monographs and 95% of current serials in RLIN. 40$ of retrospective monographs and 45% of retrospective serials on OCLC and RLIN

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Dartmouth	Current monographs - A Retrospective mono-graphs and all serials - B	5% of current monographs and 90% of current serials on RLIN. 75% of retrospective monographs and 100% of retrospective serials on OCLC.
Delaware	N.A.	N.A.
Duke	N.A.	N.A.
Emory	A	1-2% of current publications on OCLC
Florida	A	100% of 1976-1986 publications and 10% of retrospective publications on OCLC
Florida State	N.A.	N.A.
Georgetown	A	5% of post-1972 monographs on OCLC
Georgia	A	Very few records on OCLC
Georgia Tech	Current monographs - A Retrospective mono-graphs and all serials - B	N.A.
Harvard	A	20% of current publications on OCLC
Hawaii	A	5% of current monographs, 2% of current serials, 2% of retrospective monographs and less than 1% of retrospective serials on OCLC

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Houston	A	Very few records on OCLC
Howard	N.A.	N.A.
Illinois	B	95% of monographs since 1975 and 98% of serials since 1977 on OCLC
Indiana	Publications after 1940 - A Publications to 1940 - B	3% of current monographs and 5% of current serials on OCLC
Iowa	A	15% of current monographs, 2% of retrospective monographs, and 1% of all serials on RLIN
Iowa State	A	640 current monographs and 120 current serials on OCLC
Johns Hopkins	N.A.	N.A.
Kansas	A	Very few records on OCLC
Kent State	B	95% of current monographs and 98% of current serials on OCLC. 1% pre-1973 monographs and 95% of post 1973 monographs on OCLC 95% pre-1973 and 98% of post-1973 serials on OCLC
Kentucky	A	125 current monographs and 300 current serials on OCLC. 5% of retrospective monographs and 10% of retrospective serials on OCLC
Linda Hall	A	1-2% of monographs and less than 1% of serials
Louisiana State	A	No national records reported

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Maryland	A	5% of current monographs and 10% of retrospective monographs on OCLC
Massachusetts	B	Records reported. No national
MIT	A	10% of current publications on OCLC
Miami	Abbreviated AACR in-house record	Very few records on OCLC
Michigan	Current monographs - A Retrospective mono -graphs and all serials - B	1% of current monographs and 10% of current serials, 10% of retrospective monographs and 15% retrospective serials on RLIN
Michigan State	A	2% of all monographs and 1% of all serials on OCLC
Minnesota	A	1% of all publications on RLIN
Missouri	A	Very few publications on OCLC
Nebraska	A	2% of current monographs and 15% of current serials on OCLC
New Mexico	N.A.	N.A.
New York P.L.	B	100% of all paper format publications 1971-1986 on RLIN
New York State L.	Monographs and retrospective serials - B Current serials on Faxon LINX	100% of current serials on OCLC

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
New York U	No shelflist, indexes provide access	10% of current monographs on RLIN
North Carolina	A	Very few records on OCLC
North Carolina State	A	No national records reported
Northwestern	A	Very few records on RLIN
Notre Dame	1968 - A Pre-1968 - B	1% of current monographs, 25% current serials, 50% of retrospective monographs, and 100% of retrospective serials on OCLC
Ohio State	B	Very few records on OCLC
Oklahoma	N.A.	N.A.
Oregon	Current publications - indexes and abstracts. Retrospective - B	1% of current monographs and 3% of current serials on OCLC
Pennsylvania	N.A.	N.A.
Penn State	Current publications - A Retrospective publications - B	100% of current monographs, 60% current serials, and 20% of retrospective monographs on OCLC and RLIN
Pittsburgh	Monographs - A Serials - ULS periodicals and serials list	80% of serials on OCLC
Princeton	A	Very few records on RLIN
Purdue	Current publications - B Retrospective publications - A	75% of current monographs, 50% current serials, 1% retrospective monographs

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Rice	A	Very few records on OCLC
Rochester	A	15% of current monographs 50% of current serials, and 100% of retrospective monographs on OCLC
Rutgers	A	Less than 1% of records on RLIN
South Carolina	N.A.	N.A.
Southern California	N.A.	N.A.
Southern Illinois	A	3% of all serials and 1% of retrospective monographs on OCLC
Stanford	A	1% of monographs and 100% of serials on RLIN
SUNY Albany	A	2% of monographs and 10% of serials on OCLC
SUNY Buffalo	A	Very few records on OCLC and RLIN
SUNY Stonybrook	N.A.	N.A.
Syracuse	Serials - B For monographs, indexes provide access	Very few records on OCLC
Temple	A	1-5% of current publications on RLIN
Tennessee	Pre-1976 - B 1976 - A	2% of current monographs and 20% of current serials on OCLC
Texas	Current publications - A Retrospective publications - B	20% of current monographs, 60% of current serials, 10% of retrospective monographs, and 30% of retrospective serials on OCLC

Institution	Predominant form of bibliographic control	Availability of national online records
Texas A&M	A	Very few records on OCLC
Tulane	N.A.	N.A.
Utah	N.A.	N.A.
Vanderbilt	N.A.	N.A.
Virginia	A	Very few records on OCLC
Virginia Polytechnic	Monographs - A Serials - B	10% of current monographs and 60% of current serials on OCLC
Washington	A	10% of current monographs on OCLC and 40% of current serials on OCLC and WLN
Washington State	Monographs - A Serials - B	15% of current monographs, 100% of current serials, 1% of retrospective monographs, and 50% of retrospective serials on WLN
Winconsin	B	90% of current publications on OCLC
Yale	A	5% of serials on RLIN

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS ISSUES AND NEEDS

Survey respondents were asked to identify "the major bibliographic control problems related to U.S. federal publications in the library." Their responses provide a long list of situations and practices that inhibit access. The problems can be outlined as follows:

* The idiosyncrasies of government publications; distribution and cataloging practices of the U.S. Government Printing Office;

* Scarce human and other resources in libraries; and

* Non-standard treatment of U.S. government publications that removes them from the library's bibliographic mainstream.

Documents librarians generally view government publications as bibliographically complex entities. When key governmental players change, so does governmental structure and the publications issued by the agencies that compromise that structure. Providing bibliographic links for changes in title and issuing agency can be daunting, particularly when these changes are not well documented (and this is a frequent occurrence). Further problems result from distribution patterns for government publications. Some publications produced by agencies of the U.S. federal government are issued in very small quantities and are not distributed through the Government Printing Office. Others may be classified or restricted from distribution at the time of publication. Even if the restriction is removed at a later date, the availability is not publicized. It is extremely difficult for librarians or library users to be aware of the existence of such publications or to be successful in acquiring them once their existence is known.

Because the U.S. Government Printing Office is the principal printer, distributor, and cataloger of U.S. government publications, its practices are critically important to every library that collects U.S. federal publications. Some of its practices are the source of significant bibliographic control problems for individual research libraries. Among the practices identified as problems are:

* The limited indexing provided prior to 1976,

* Current delays in indexing and cataloging publications,

* The policy of cataloging individual monographs within a series without cataloging the series, and

* The recent decision to pull out and separately catalog series within established series (e.g., Current Population Reports).

Several respondents cited GPO errors and class changes as significant problems. A prevailing concern is the "dirtiness" or inconsistency of the GPO tapes. Since July, 1976, the Government Printing Office has been providing standard cataloging for U.S. federal publications and distributing the cataloging copy on magnetic tape. In theory, the availability of full cataloging records created by the national cataloging authority for U.S. government publications on an inexpensive tape should have virtually eliminated bibliographic access problems in individual libraries. However, this has not happened. The tapes present many technical problems that inhibit easy loading. Furthermore, there is no mechanism for updating the tapes to incorporate corrections, even those provided by GPO in the Monthly Catalog. The need for corrections has been well-documented, by both document librarians and the GPO. GPO issued a contract notice in the October, 1985, Commerce Business Daily, but reduced funding prevented any action.

At the local level, scarce resources frequently have had an impact on bibliographic access to government publications. Several libraries noted that there was not sufficient staff to process incoming documents and to handle the many record changes associated with them. Many libraries lamented the fact that limited resources prohibit cataloging all the documents that should be fully cataloged. Because resources are limited and because U.S. documents are an easily identified and voluminous part of a library's collection, U.S. documents have generally not been treated the same as other materials in the libraries surveyed. This different, and generally sub-standard, treatment of U.S. federal publications was the most frequently identified bibliographic control problem among survey respondents.

The overwhelming majority of responding libraries indicated that all U.S. federal government publications do not receive the same level of bibliographic control in their library. Generally the majority of publications are uncataloged and housed in a centralized document collection. However, some publications do receive full cataloging. The criteria most frequently cited as the determinant for cataloging is location. Typically materials selected for a branch or for the central reference or general collection receive full cataloging. Anticipated use, subject, and anticipated research or permanent value are prominent criteria used to determine the level of bibliographic control for an individual government publication. Some libraries make decisions on the basis of format. For example, serials frequently are selected for cataloging while pamphlets, posters, technical reports, and microforms are often arbitrarily uncataloged because of format. Some libraries also employ such user-centered criteria as the availability of access tools, requirements for assistance in access, and "recognizability" as a government publication in determining whether to provide full

cataloging. One library cited the availability of cataloging copy as a determinant of whether a publication receives full cataloging.

A different level of bibliographic control for some or most documents has led to a plethora of trouble. Some libraries pointed out a lack of consistency in what has been and has not been cataloged. Especially troublesome are cataloging decisions which result in split series with some titles fully cataloged and some processed with SuDocs (Superintendent of Documents) class for the central documents collection. In other instances chronological cutoffs have been used with material received before a certain date fully cataloged and later materials processed without full cataloging. Users are likely to be confused no matter which cataloging decisions are made, e.g., whether recent receipts are uncataloged or recent receipts in established series continue to be cataloged but new series are not.

Further problems arise when there are multiple copies of the same title in a library or library system but they are treated differently bibliographically. Respondents pointed out user confusion when branch copies are cataloged and the same title housed in a central documents collection is not and when an online catalog supports a multi-library system in which some libraries catalog their documents and others do not. Finally, respondents described the ramifications of excluding materials from the bibliographic mainstream in a library. In cases where government publications are excluded from the library's main catalog, services become crucial. Foremost are: the expertise of document librarians in locating information; the document librarian's skill in networking with colleagues, carrying out bibliographic instruction, and promoting collection use; and the accessibility and visibility of finding aids. Even under the best of circumstances, many library users will be unaware of documents, and an extremely valuable resource will be underutilized.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR PROVIDING ACCESS

THE SHELFLIST AND PRINTED INDEXES

The predominant form of bibliographic control of and bibliographic access to U.S. federal publications is the inhouse shelflist consisting of brief agency/title information and the Superintendent of Documents (SuDoc) classification number supplemented by printed indexes, e.g. the Monthly Catalog and the CIS/Index. Although a primary intent of this paper is to share information about automated means of achieving bibliographic access, it is notable that there has been some movement toward the inhouse shelflist, or brief cataloging, and away from the union card catalog or online bibliographic system.

Reliance on the shelflist is not seen as a totally bleak situation. Benefits of the shelflist are low costs of creation and maintenance (a student often types shelflist cards as materials are received) and prompt bibliographic access to new materials.

Disadvantages of the inhouse shelflist and the use of printed indexes center on the difficulties of connecting the user with the publication and on making the user aware of the existence of separate document collections. These "connection" problems are heightened when online catalogs are present, for there seems to be an expectation that all of a library's resources are in the online catalog. Additional problems are the drain on staff time spent introducing users to the bibliographies, both government and privately produced.

- -

CASE STUDY: THE SHELFLIST AND PRINTED INDEXES

DARTMOUTH

In response to a variety of problems concerning government documents, it was decided at Dartmouth in 1979 to create a separate documents collection - thus creating different levels of bibliographic control and access for government publications. "Among these were technical processing concerns (both cataloging and classifying, the advent of the distribution of documents in microfiche, the increased value of commercial reference sources, and the desire to maintain the collection as an integral part of

reference services," as reported by Robert D. Jaccaud, Dartmouth College Library. Monographs and serials are treated differently with many new federal serials cataloged with the Library of Congress classification number and shelved with the general collection in the main library or at an appropriate branch library. However, because of various processing problems, (e.g. dual format), a new serial remains in the Superintendent of Documents collection until two issues are received and a few serials (e.g., newsletters and ephemeral materials), are housed uncataloged in the documents collection. Since 1979 few monographs have been cataloged.

Bibliographic control of the present separate documents collection is provided by a printed monthly list that is entered daily on an Apple Macintosh computer by student assistants in the Government Documents Center. Bibliographic access is facilitated by well trained reference librarians, an active bibliographic instruction program, and a highly visible documents collection.

For further information contact:

Robert D. Jaccaud
Dartmouth College Library
(603) 646-3616

- -

TRADITIONAL CATALOGING

Survey results indicate a greater movement away from traditional cataloging than toward this standard means of bibliographic control. For this survey we defined traditional cataloging to be the creation of bibliographic records according to current Anglo American cataloging rules using MARC format with subject analysis according to national standards e.g. the Library of Congress List of Subject Headings. Libraries, including Temple, Michigan, Columbia, Oregon, Dartmouth, MIT, Princeton and New York Public have stopped cataloging all or significant portions of their collections.

Costs of cataloging coupled with the availability of comprehensive printed indexes [Congressional Information Service, (CIS), American Statistics Index, (ASI), and the Monthly Catalog of Government Publications] are cited as predominant reasons for not cataloging federal government publications. Another reason is the change in format from paper to microfiche by the Government Printing Office coupled with a reluctance of some catalog departments to deal with microfiche There appears to be a linking of rising costs, change in format, and an increase in volume of materials published by GPO, all occurring since 1976.

Also, analysis of survey results indicates a coupling of movement away from mainstream cataloging with physical movement toward centralized collections organized by the Superintendent of Documents call numbers. The following libraries illustrate this movement: Columbia, centralized in 1976; Dartmouth centralized in 1979; Indiana, centralized in 1940; Princeton, centralized in 1979; and Notre Dame, centralized in 1968.

Survey results also highlight a disparity in cataloging treatment of monographs versus serials - the University of Michigan, New York Public and Georgia Tech have ceased cataloging monographs, and numerous libraries have begun providing greater bibliographic access to serials through inclusion in online catalogs or in microfiche serials catalogs inclusive of all library holdings.

Although it seems self-evident, note should be made that decentralized document collections, e.g., Cornell, University of Chicago, Ohio State, and Purdue, continue to provide full level AACRII cataloging for U.S. federal documents thus insuring equal access to these materials.

CASE STUDIES: TRADITIONAL CATALOGING

PENNSYLVANIA STATE

In July, 1986, Pennsylvania State University Library began full level AACRII cataloging of U.S. federal documents in their local online catalog system, LIAS. Prior to putting documents records into the bibliographic mainstream, extensive studies of the documents collections and circulation were conducted as well as studies of technical considerations, such as the availability of machine-readable cataloging records and authority control.(1) This study as well as studies in 1980 and 1982 conducted by Diane Smith of Penn State "... were based upon the assumption that entry of documents into the PSUL [Pennsylvania State University Libraries] database is both technologically feasible and practical from a management viewpoint".(2) Another assumption was that LIAS, the online catalog termed Library Information Access System, should be reflective of all Penn State library holdings including the various document collections.

The Jamison study sought to answer these questions:

> *"Is it possible to prioritize selection of documents in-put into LIAS based on evaluations of subject emphasis and of usefulness of patrons regardless of issuing source?*
>
> *Which systems features need to be addressed in regard to LIAS before documents can be entered and be fully accessible to users of the system, both patron and PSUL staff users?*
>
> *Which areas of organization, management, and personnel need special study and planning before implementation of the recommendations regarding input of documents?"*

From analysis of the departmental affiliations of the primary clientele - faculty and students - and from analysis of document circulation by subject, it was concluded that 83% of the document collection should be put into LIAS. Given this high percentage, it was determined that the needs of both library management and users would best be served by including all documents in LIAS rather than including documents by particular subject categories. Some arguments leading to this conclusion were the difficulties experienced by users who find some documents but not all in a bibliographic database and the difficulties of training library staff to enter only certain subject groups of documents. It was further determined that implementation of documents entry into LIAS would be influenced by the unique situation that the

Documents Section is an acquisitions point for the receipt of materials and that it would be inefficient to send them elsewhere to be processed and then returned to Documents for shelving.

The question of retrospective conversion focused on the need for editing of GPO retrospective tapes and the availability of edited versions, and it was agreed to enter retrospective records individually at the point of circulation. However, priorities have been assigned for certain groups of publications e.g. Congressional.

Selectively determining the level of bibliographic control for each publication or category of publication was discussed when Penn State began to enter records. Because the number of access points and elements considered necessary were so numerous, it was decided to provide full level cataloging for all materials. On her survey response Diane Smith states, "It became very difficult, if not impossible, to base level of cataloging on pagination, format, etc. It is very hard to say that a small pamphlet doesn't contain valuable information to someone."

In the development of processing procedures, the goal was to replicate the cataloging workflow for any book in the Penn State Library system.

The following workflow procedures were broadly outlined by Carolyn Jamison:

1. *Documents received by Documents Section*
2. *Classification numbers assigned, bar code labels applied*
3. *Sorted by monographs for LIAS processing and serials for Faxon check-in*
4. *Monographs searched by Documents staff in LIAS, MARC and GPO tapes (if loaded) for cataloging copy*
5. *MLP records set up if no copy found*
6. *Serials searched by Documents staff in Faxon for check-in record*
7. *Faxon and MLP records set up if no check-in record found*
8. *ICP record created*
9. *OCLC searched for copy*
10. *Documents sent to review shelf*
11. *MlP records stay in documents action queue to be searched through regular mlp re-search procedures*
12. *After re-search procedures completed, remaining documents referred for subject heading assignment"*

The cataloging operation for Penn State documents is operating smoothly with a consistently high hit rate for finding full copy. It is anticipated that a quarterly tape of Penn State holdings will be loaded into OCLC and that a similar tape load will be made into RLIN.

For further information contact:

Carolyn Jamison
Pennsylvania State University Library
(814) 865-4861

---

(1) Carolyn Jamison, "An Analysis of Issues Relating to the Entry of Government Documents into the LIAS Database," University Park, PA, 1985, p. 1

(2) Diane Harvey Smith, "Government Document Call Number Analysis; Document BRS10 Reassignment, Part 1" [University Park, PA] Library Research and Standards, Pennsylvania State University Libraries, 1980, p.1

CORNELL, OLIN LIBRARY

There are two groups of federal government publications which do not receive full AACRII bibliographic control at the Olin Library. Any publication which is not selected by a bibliographer for addition to the permanent collection receives no bibliographic control and receives treatment based on format. Hard copy publications are stored by item number and are retrievable on request; microfiche publications are filed by Superintendent of Documents classification in a file directly accessible to the public. Because of format, monographic publications in microfiche are not reviewed for addition to the collection but are automatically filed in the Superintendent of Documents classification file. Another criteria used in making the decision concerning monographs in microfiche is the subject and anticipated use of many of the publications which have been converted by GPO to microfiche.

Bibliographic access and control of currently received materials selected for the permanent collection are achieved by entering them into the RLIN Acquisitions System. Congressional hearings and committee prints are entered within one to two days

of receipt. Departmental monographs are entered within a month of receipt. These materials then are integrated with other books and serials into the cataloging backlog and full AACRII records are created by Catalog Department Staff and appear in RLIN.

For further information, contact:

Julia G. Stiles
Cornell University Libraries
(607) 255-5118

- -

LOADING THE GPO TAPES

In 1976 the Government Printing Office began to catalog on OCLC following AACR and standard conventions and guidelines. The GPO became a Name Authority Cooperative Project (NACO) participant in 1981. In the same year it was designated the national cataloging authority for U.S. federal government publications. GPO cataloging records from July, 1976, onward are available in MARC format on magnetic tape at a reasonable price from the Cataloging Distribution Service (CSD) at the Library of Congress.

Despite consensus that U.S. federal government publications constitute a voluminous body of valuable material that has been bibliographically inaccessible and, therefore, under-used in most research libraries, few libraries have jumped on the GPO tape bandwagon. Only about 10% of the respondents to this survey reported that they have acquired and loaded the GPO tapes. Individual libraries may have used the tapes via OCLC or RLIN for cataloging or as a reference tool, but they generally have not purchased the tapes from the Library of Congress and loaded them into their online catalogs to represent local holdings. Several respondents did report, however, that purchase of the tapes is being considered for their libraries.

The fact is the GPO tapes have been problematical. There are a wide range of technical difficulties relating to both the physical tapes and the data content that have inhibited easy loading. There are further problems that derive from GPO cataloging policies and from inconsistent practices and the absence of adequate quality control mechanisms. These problems have been chronicled in the literature and in numerous programs and presentations. A comprehensive discussion appears in the article by Judy Myers in Government Information Quarterly, volume 2, number 1.

Given the tapes' potential boon to bibliographic access, the obvious problems crying for cleanup projects, and the various requirements of individual libraries, it is not surprising that commercial firms have entered the GPO tape market. At present two firms, Brodart and Marcive, are marketing the tapes. Each provides both a retrospective tape (back to July, 1976) and an ongoing subscription service. Each offers library-specific tape extractions derived from a profile (by item number, SuDoc stem, or Monthly Catalog number) developed by the library. Each claims tape corrections and enhancements.

Brodart's enhancements include: keying in the Monthly Catalog correction pages; applying LC name and subject authorities to the files; correcting various tags (moving key numbers from 500 note fields to appropriate indexed fields) and indicators; using the 948 tag for serials to link individual titles to series records; and offering the option of selecting master serial records, individual

records, or both. (More information may be obtained from Russ Thompson 800-233-8467). Marcive, the first firm to offer the tapes, also offers a subject authority control service. The firm has retagged critical numbers, and it is launching a major project (described below) to clean up the tapes. (More information may be obtained from Jim Plaunt 800-531-7678).

The following case studies illustrate how individual libraries are using the tapes acquired form LC/CDS, Brodart, and Marcive. These cases give some indication of the state of the art of utilizing the GPO tapes and of the issues related to integrating them into local online systems. The improved quality of the basic tapes in recent years and the cleanup efforts of Brodart and Marcive indicate a great potential for bringing the tapes into local systems.

- -

CASE STUDIES: LOADING THE GPO TAPES

NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY

Ohio State University and the New York State Library reported that they purchase the GPO tapes from the Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service and load them directly into their online catalogs. Document librarian Mary Redmond at the New York State Library is very satisfied with the results of loading the tapes into their CMS (collection management system.)

The New York State Library is a regional depository library that purchases non-depository documents from Readex. Because their holdings of material included in the Monthly Catalog should be complete, the Library decided to load all GPO monograph and map records (serials are recorded on the Faxon LINX system) beginning in January, 1985. New York State Library documents staff check materials off on the GPO shipping list, house them in a SuDocs collection, and rely on the GPO records for access. Loading the tapes is done by the State Education Department EDP staff. There were some initial problems with inadequate documentation for the tapes and with call number displays in the local catalog (numbers were initially truncated at the colon), but these have been resolved. The problem of separate records for monographs issued in parts is being resolved by catalogers combing records and making other necessary changes.

Loading the tapes has saved processing and cataloging time and greatly enhanced access. To date there have been no problems

of online records in the catalog for material not owned by the library. This library's experience seems to support reports that the major problems with GPO tapes occurred in the early years and that benefits far outweigh remaining problems with recent tapes.

For further information, contact:

Mary Redmond
New York State Library
518-474-3940

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Late in 1986 the Florida Center for Library Automation, which provides automation support for the nine campuses of Florida's State University System (SUS), purchased the GPO tapes for 1976-1986 from Brodart. The plan is to load records for the libraries' document holdings into LUIS, the state's online NOTIS catalog and into OCLC. Three SUS libraries have chosen not to participate in the Brodart project for various reasons. Five libraries are developing item number-based profiles. The University of Florida, a regional depository which purchases Readex non-depository microfiche, will have its holdings symbol attached to all records on the tapes.

Although the GPO records have not yet been loaded into LUIS, University of Florida holdings symbols were added to GPO's records in OCLC in April, 1987. This has created a flurry of interlibrary loan activity. ILL requests for U.S. documents have gone up by a factor of five. The major problem created by the increase has been receipt of requests for non-depository materials not yet distributed by Readex. This problem is being resolved by removing Florida's symbol from the non-depository records in OCLC. The volume of ILL requests from around the country illustrates the need to provide holdings information for all document collections on the national utilities. It is apparent that ILL staff either do not recognize publications requested as documents or are unaware of local depository libraries, or both.

Documents and systems staff are analyzing what must be done to load the tapes effectively in LUIS. Detailed specifications will be developed for the FCLA. Beyond the specifications and the load there are two underlying concerns: insuring that the records loaded will accurately reflect holdings and developing an effective plan to implement the myriad procedural changes associated with moving from a manual to an automated environment.

Insuring accurate holdings will require developing procedures to add non-depository documents to the online catalog when they

become available. It also mandates accurate online representation of depository material that has been separated from the SuDocs collection and processed for other locations. About 10% of Florida's U.S. federal publications have received AACR cataloging and are already included in LUIS. These are housed in the Central Science Library, the main library stack, or other locations apart from the central documents collection. Maps are housed in the Map Library. It will be necessary to remove the SuDoc "ghost" records for all of these materials to avoid user confusion. It will also be important to insure that materials received in microfiche rather than paper are clearly identified in the online record. Efforts to achieve accurate holdings records will be challenged by some remaining tape problems. The OCLC number is typically used in the tape matching process. But, the tapes contain thousands of records with duplicate OCLC numbers, there are some records with no OCLC numbers, there are some records with multiple SuDoc numbers, and there are access numbers that remain in the inaccessible 500 note field. Thus, even the relatively clean Brodart tapes pose some obstacles when there is an effort to merge them with existing records to provide a complete and accurate report of a large library's U.S. federal publications holdings.

There are many issues to be resolved in the whole process of bringing the documents, which have been handled manually, into the mainstream of the larger library which has automated many of its processes. No decision has yet been made on how to handle records for current materials. It seems most desirable to create an online record at the time a publication is received and to overlay the temporary record with a full cataloging record when it appears on tape. Exactly how this may be done and by whom have not been determined. Other library units at Florida check in their serials online and barcode publications for circulation via an automated system. It is desirable to analyze the feasibility of implementing these systems for the central documents collection and to begin planning if implementation is approved. The procedural questions suggest issues of principle (such as who is responsible for maintaining the integrity of the database and determining how various authority records will be meshed) which must ultimately be resolved.

For further information, contact:

Sally Cravens
University of Florida
(904) 392-0367

RICE UNIVERSITY AND TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

One of the most exciting developments on the current GPO tape scene is the tape cleanup project being undertaken by Rice University and Texas A & M University (and perhaps one or two other institutions) in conjunction with Marcive. For many years Judy Myers and others have been specifying what must be done to make the tapes clean and usable in libraries. An agreement has now been drafted whereby the participating libraries will go through the GPO tape records and code the necessary changes for MARCIVE implementation. The participating libraries will then load tapes with their library-specific item number selections into their existing local online catalogs. For example, Rice has a NOTIS catalog. Marcive is working with NOTIS to insure compatibility, and will provide the specific records that Rice designates.

The project, which will involve the tapes issued from 1976 through 1986 (at present there is not provision for an ongoing project), should be completed by January, 1988. Cleanup involves the following procedures: making corrections and changes noted in the Monthly Catalog; coding missing primary control numbers (SuDocs and OCLC) into the appropriate fields; changing or deleting duplicate and availability records, including serials, supplement titles, infrequent serials, and monographs in parts; correcting inaccurate fixed fields and indicators; correcting spelling and index listing errors; adding technical report numbers to the 088 field; providing a means for inserting a holding library code and/or location code for materials distributed in microfiche; and automatically processing all records against the Library of Congress subject and name authority files. This project will be a major contribution to existing efforts to improve bibliographic access to U.S. federal publications.

For further information, contact:

Barbara Kile
Rice University
(713) 523-2417

- -

RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION

Retrospective conversion (recon) is defined as changing manual bibliographic records to machine-readable form. It generally includes reclassification of Dewey classification numbers to Library of Congress numbers but often federal documents are converted with Superintendent of Documents classification numbers. Results from this survey indicate a myriad of recon methodologies utilized by ARL Libraries. At the same time, there are few recon projects designed for comprehensive conversion of federal documents which are housed in separate centralized document collections.

CASE STUDIES: RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION

CASE WESTERN RESERVE

Case Western Reserve, a centralized documents collection classed by SuDoc number, has been converting documents records to machine-readable form since 1976. This ongoing recon project has completed conversion of records for items listed in the Monthly Catalog for the years 1970-1981. Current plans call for computer conversion of records for 1981-86 as part of a larger library-wide RECON project using OCLC MICROCON. OCLC MICROCON consists of OCLC software and workstation - an IBM personal computer with OCLC modifications - supplied to contracting libraries by OCLC and returned to OCLC upon completion of the recon projects.

At Case Western Reserve a level III library clerk assisted by students creates bibliographic records as follows:

Case Western Reserve holdings of federal documents are noted by annotations in the Monthly Catalog.

The OCLC number for each Monthly Catalog entry held is keyed into the P.C. in the search key field.

Local bibliographic data is keyed in and records are created.

These records are stored on floppy disks, (600 per disk); and when thirty disks are full, they are sent to OCLC which converts them to machine-readable tape and runs them against the OCLC database. The library's identifier is then added to the master OCLC record, and a tape of machine-readable records of the OCLC

bibliographic record with the local call number and holdings is produced. These records are then added to the local catalog.

For further information, contact:

Tim Robson or George Kosman
Case Western Reserve
(216) 368-6512

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

The University of Cincinnati Libraries are actively converting federal documents and have given first priority to serials and periodicals and to pre-1986 titles. Fifteen hours per week of student assistance is allotted by the Catalog Department for conversion of documents in the centralized SuDoc collection. Initially titles from the first Periodicals Supplement to the Monthly Catalog were searched against OCLC; and when a match was made, Cincinnati's holdings were attached to the OCLC record, and a record was created for Cincinnati's local online catalog. Following completion of the Periodicals Supplement, students have proceeded on a drawer by drawer approach using the manual shelflist. Since serials and periodicals are almost converted (C's for Census and L's for Labor Statistics were excluded because of call number changes), the students have started converting records for Congressional hearings. To date, there is no maintenance of the converted serial records.

For further information, contact:

Karen Kottsy
University of Cincinnati
(513) 475-5009

CORNELL, OLIN LIBRARY

U.S. federal government publications are included in any retrospective conversion project undertaken by Olin Library, where the documents are primarily decentralized and are cataloged according to AACRII standards. The percentage of documents selected for conversion depends upon their representation in the LC classes which are undergoing conversion. Cornell's largest conversion project for monograph titles was in LC classes Q-T (Science and Technology). A small project of some significance for documents was an RLG sponsored conversion of LC class JX (International Law).

Two current conversion projects include U.S. federal government publications. The first, a project to convert all titles in LC classes Q-T, will be completed in August, 1987. The second, which began under a three year NEH grant but is now locally funded, is designed to complete conversion of all non-current serial titles in the humanities and social sciences. Although there are no other projects underway for conversion of social science materials, Cornell is committed to conversion of these materials as time and funds allow.

For further information, contact:

Julia G. Stiles
John N. Olin Library
Cornell University
(607) 255-5118

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES AND IRVINE

Retrospective conversion efforts of U.S. federal publications at UCLA illustrate the sometimes uneven bibliographic treatment of documents which is often directly correlated to shelving location and/or anticipated use. Although most federal documents at UCLA are housed in the Public Affairs Service (P.A.S.) Library, lower use titles are housed in the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF); bound issues of serials are shelved in the main library; and selected titles are shelved in appropriate branch libraries if the subject matter dictates higher use there.

As reported by Lauri Sebo of the Public Affairs Service, UCLA, the following conversion efforts are underway:

1. Fully cataloged U.S. documents are being converted via the major UCLA Library recon effort based on conversion of all items in the main shelflist.

2. Conversion of manual records for uncataloged U.S. documents designated for the SRLF (primarily U.S. Congressional publications pre 1979 so far) is an ongoing project. The records are converted to machine-readable tape.

3. As part of ongoing review of its collections, P.A.S. identified titles for conversion to full AACRII cataloging by the Catalog Department. These materials are then added to the main library collection. Materials are also identified for conversion by P.A.S. staff who create records for the in

process file with limited authority control and no subject headings. These materials remain in P.A.S.

Conversion of records for the materials sent to the storage facility is of particular interest. Because materials cannot be stored without machine-readable records, lesser use materials have greater bibliographic control than some heavier use materials. As reported by Judy Horn, UC Irvine,

> *"Current reconversion projects for government publications include only those low use items that have been designated for off-campus storage since the material cannot be stored without machine-readable tapes. This is being done with funding specified for reconversion of materials for storage."*

For further information, contact:

Lauri Sebo
UCLA
(213) 825-2146

Judy Horn
UC Irvine
(714) 856-4344

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A key to improving access to U.S. federal government publications is the availability of the GPO tapes from July 1976 onward. Some libraries are using the GPO records on OCLC or RLIN for copy cataloging, while others are purchasing the tapes and loading them directly into local databases. Still, less is being done with either method than anticipated when the survey was conducted. There are also fewer retrospective conversion efforts and cooperative projects than expected. However, many libraries are planning or beginning to implement projects that will improve access to their collections. Several viable methods for providing improved access to federal government publications in a cost-effective manner have emerged in the various library plans. The widely accepted assumption that it is too costly for most research libraries to provide standard bibliographic access to U.S. federal documents can and should be challenged, because it is possible for individual libraries to include U.S. federal documents in the local bibliographic mainstream. There are opportunities for cooperative projects and for sharing experiences, techniques and products.

Several recommendations can be made to a library about to embark on a project to improve access to its federal documents. First and foremost is the need for project planning. Any plan to improve access must be based on a thorough analysis of the current situation and a careful definition of what is to be achieved through the project. The analysis should cover: the current levels, methods, and variations in bibliographic control for the library's U.S. federal documents; existing or desired standards for bibliographic control for non-documents; a determination of what would be required to bring the document collection(s) to that level of bibliographic control; a review of current workflow for document processing; a review of which staff are responsible for processing documents, for processing other materials, and for maintaining the integrity of the library's mainstream catalog; a close assessment of available resources including staff, technological support, and so forth; and a review of existing priorities and time tables. The result of this analysis can include a clear definition of what is wanted, a description of how it is to be achieved, and an allocation of adequate resources to achieve it.

In taking this kind of planning approach, it is likely that each library will discover the existing situation is more complex than a brief look would have suggested. It is also most likely that the complexity is manageable when divided into its component parts. For example, Stanford University's government documents staff set out to describe a project that would add standard bibliographic records to the online catalog for all federal government publications in Stanford's collections.

What the staff discovered, however, was not one project, but seven. The projects are: 1) Loading the GPO tapes from July 1976

to date into the online catalog; 2) Loading current GPO tape records into the online catalog on an ongoing basis; 3) Providing standard cataloging with SuDocs class numbers for current materials that are not on the GPO tapes; 4) Retrospectively converting pre-1976 materials using copy available on RLIN or OCLC; 5) Retrospectively converting records for federal documents that have been fully cataloged for branches or the main stack but that are not yet in machine-readable form; 6) Upgrading serial records included in the online catalog but lacking standard cataloging; and 7) Providing original cataloging with SuDocs class numbers for pre-1976 materials and with no copy. Once the projects were defined in this manner, it became relatively easy to determine who must be involved in each, to determine the time and dollars required, and to establish priorities.

The projects that Stanford defined are specific to one institution with its unique history, current situation, and aspirations. Yet, it is likely that most libraries will define a plan containing more than one project. Dividing master plans into a number of discrete parts is necessary at the local level. This approach also has the advantage of making it easier to develop cooperative programs because several libraries may need the same individual projects or parts.

Most plans involve the GPO tapes. The availability of the tapes has made it possible for libraries to acquire large numbers of standard cataloging records at minimal cost. The efforts of the two commercial vendors to clean up the tapes should be commended, but there must be a commitment to make corrections to the tapes available on an ongoing basis. Neither vendor currently includes a correction tape with an annual subscription to monthly issues of the GPO tapes. This need should be met. An even better solution would be correction at the source, i.e., inclusion of corrections that appear in the printed Monthly Catalog along with GPO's cataloging in OCLC. There are a relatively small number of corrections made to the records, but the omission of these corrections from the tapes has been a problem since the outset of tape distribution. We urge GPO to put its corrections into machine-readable form for distribution with the tapes.

Another access issue involves the role of the utilities and the value to individual libraries of having records for U.S. documents included in the utilities. At the present time, most research libraries surveyed are including small percentages of their U.S. federal document records in OCLC or RLIN. Although both of the utilities have loaded the GPO tapes, neither has offered special incentives or mechanisms for libraries to add specific holdings. Consequently, records for U.S. document records included in the utilities are provided by those libraries with a tradition of fully cataloging all or most of their documents. Both OCLC and RLIN have been approached about programs whereby holdings would be attached to GPO tape records according to some kind of library

profile. DARP (for OCLC) or "batch cataloging" (for RLIN) is not a new concept. It takes on new complexities, however, when it is applied to federal documents distributed according to individual selection profiles through the federal depository library program rather than to a microform set for which analytic catalog records can be obtained in a batch mode via the utilities. The complexities should not be ignored, but they also should not inhibit exploration. Pilot projects could evaluate the feasibility of this approach.

An alternate incentive would be a reduced rate for copy cataloging from the GPO tapes. This approach would appeal to libraries that currently catalog their federal documents and to those finding the automatic aspect of a batch approach unacceptable or lacking adequate control. The increased interlibrary borrowing from the University of Florida after its records were included in OCLC clearly indicates the usefulness of including records from more libraries in the utilities. An incentive program encouraging more libraries to add more document records to the utilities would enhance access both by facilitating interlibrary loan and by encouraging cooperative programs and resource sharing.

Retrospective conversion projects offer another important avenue for enhancing bibliographic access. If libraries currently engaged in retrospective conversion projects would include U.S. federal document recon records in the utilities, this would aid the efforts of individual libraries to improve access to local holdings and facilitate sharing of resources. Retrospective conversion of the great bulk of U.S. federal documents is a manageable task involving a universe of about 100,000 records. This figure is based on a 1984 grant proposal by Texas A&M, Stanford, and the University of Houston which estimated that there were 65,300 titles with printed but no online copy and 10,300 titles requiring original cataloging in the combined U.S. federal documents collections of the three libraries. If the universe of U.S. documents not included in the utilities is clearly and fully defined and the interests and cataloging strengths of individual libraries identified, dividing this cataloging workload among interested libraries is feasible. A coordinating body could serve as a clearinghouse, linking individual library conversion and cataloging projects. A further incentive is required to insure that the records are entered in the utilities--grant funding or some other means of absorbing costs.

Technological advances offer unprecedented opportunities for improving bibliographic access to U.S. federal government publications. It is feasible for libraries to provide parity in access for this valuable, but underutilized, body of research material. Successful integration of federal document records into the bibliographic mainstream requires careful analysis and planning in individual libraries combined with cooperative efforts supported by the GPO, tape-supplying vendors, the bibliographic utilities, and foundations and associations.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bahr, Alice Harrison, "Cataloging U.S. Depository Materials: A Reevaluation", College and Research Libraries, Number, 1986, pp. 587-595.

Bower, Cynthia, "OCLC Records for Federal Depository Documents: A Preliminary Investigation", Government Information Quarterly, vol. 1, no. 4, 1984, pp. 379-400.

Bowerman, Roseann and Susan A. Cady, "Government Publications in an Online Catalog: A feasibility Study", Information Technology and Libraries, December, 1984, pp. 331-342.

Jamison, Carolyn C., "Loading the GPO Tapes -- What Does it Really Mean?", Government Publications Review, vol. 13, 1986, pp. 549-559.

Myers, Judy E. "The Government Printing Office Cataloging Records: Opportunities and Problems", Government Information Quarterly, vol. 2, no.1, 1985, pp. 27-56.

Plaunt, James R. "Cataloging Options for U.S. Government Printing Office Documents", Government Publications Review, vol. 12, 1985, pp. 449-456.

Powell, Margaret S., Deborah Smith Johnston,and Ellen P. Conrad, "The Use of OCLC for Cataloging U.S. Government Publications: A Feasibility Study", Government Publications Review, vol. 14, 1987, pp. 61-76.

Stanfield, Karen, "Documents Online: Cataloging Federal Depository Materials at the University of Illinois", Illinois Libraries, vol. 68, no. 5, 1986, pp. 325-329.

Swanbeck,Jan, "Federal Documents in the Online Catalog: Problems, Options, and the Future", Government Information Quarterly, vol. 2, no. 2, 1985, pp. 187-192.

Walbridge, Sharon, "OCLC and Government Documents Collections", Government Publications Review, vol. 9, 1982, pp. 277-287.

Walbridge, Sharon, "OCLC and Improved Access to Government Documents", Illinois Libraries, vol. 68, no. 5, 1986, pp. 329-332.

Watson, Paula D. and Kathleen M. Heim, "Patterns of Access and Circulation in a Depository Document Collection under Full Bibliographic Control", Government Publications Review, vol. 11, 1984, pp. 269-292.

System and Procedures Exchange Center

OMS
Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries
• 202-232-8656

SPEC SURVEY ON December 12, 1986
BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO U.S. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

DEFINITION: For the purpose of this survey, a U.S. federal government publication is defined as a monograph, serial, or series such as a Congressional document published by a U.S. federal government agency which takes full responsibility for the content of the material. This definition excludes technical reports issued by organizations under contract to the U.S. federal government.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS: Several questions request supporting materials such as proposals, vendor negotiation/selection documents, planning documents, final reports, evaluations, etc. Please enclose such readily-available materials with your response.

LIBRARY/INSTITUTION _____

RESPONDENT _____ PHONE _____

If the library is unable to take part in this survey, please check here _____ and return to address on last page.

1. What is the predominant form of bibliographic control used for U.S. federal government publications currently received in the library?

	Full Level AACRII	Brief In-House Record (e.g.,document shelflist)	Other (specify)
For Monographs:	☐	☐	☐ _____
For Serials:	☐	☐	☐ _____

2. Provide an estimate of the approximate number of the library's currently received U.S. federal government publication titles which are integrated into each of the following: (If you are not able to provide an approximate number, can you estimate a percentage?)

	MONOGRAPHS	SERIALS
Main Catalog	_____	_____
Union Catalog	_____	_____
Online National Utility (specify)_____	_____	_____
Brief In-House Record (e.g.,document shelflist)	_____	_____
Other (specify)_____	_____	_____

3. What is the predominant form of bibliographic control used for the library's **base or retrospective collection** of U.S. government publications?

	Full Level AACRII	Brief In-House Record (e.g.,document shelflist)	Other (specify)
For Monographs:	☐	☐	☐ _____
For Serials:	☐	☐	☐ _____

4. Provide an estimate of the approximate number of the library's **base or retrospective collection** of U.S. federal government publication titles which are integrated into each of the following: (If you are not able to provide an approximate number, can you estimate a percentage?)

	MONOGRAPHS	SERIALS
Main Catalog	_____	_____
Union Catalog	_____	_____
Online National Utility (specify)_____	_____	_____
Brief In-House Record (e.g.,document shelflist)	_____	_____
Other (specify)_____	_____	_____

_____

5. Regarding the input of GPO tapes into a local online catalog, does the library:

_____ directly input
_____ indirectly input via a vendor
_____ doesn't input
_____ other _____

6. If all U.S. federal government publications in your library do not receive the same level of bibliographic control, what determines the level? Specifically, what rationale governs the decision to provide less bibliographic access for some or all federal publications? We are interested in which criteria are used, and which are dominant, for example, anticipated use, shelving location, subject, format, etc. Discuss below, or ENCLOSE READILY AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS.

7. What are the major bibliographic control problems related to U.S. federal publications in the library? Please discuss briefly below, OR ENCLOSE READILY AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS.

8. Does the library have current or planned projects for achieving online access to currently received U.S. federal government publications?

_____ yes _____ no

If YES, please describe briefly below, OR ENCLOSE READILY-AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS.

9. Does the library have current or planned projects for retrospective conversion of U.S. federal government bibliographic records?

_____ yes _____ no

If YES, describe briefly below, or ENCLOSE READILY-AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS. (The study is particularly interested in which agencies or categories of documents are of highest priority for conversion.)

10. To what extent do reconversion projects now underway include U.S. federal government publications? Discuss briefly below, or ENCLOSE READILY-AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS.

11. Is the library able to make available to other libraries tapes or disks of bibliographic records for U.S. federal government publications?

_____ yes _____ no

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Is the library a federal depository library?

_____ yes _____ no

If YES: A. What is the date of depository designation? _____

B. What percent of currently offered depository items does the library select? _____%

C. Is the collection primarily centralized _____

primarily decentralized _____

2. Approximately how many U.S. federal government publication titles does the library acquire outside the depository library system annually?

_____ monographs

_____ serials

ENCLOSE READILY-AVAILABLE DESCRIPTIONS or discuss briefly below, e.g., do these acquisitions fall in specific subject areas, come from certain agencies or departments or from specific vendors, replace materials previously received on deposit or never previously published?)

Please bring responses to the ALA Midwinter meeting January 18, 1987, or mail responses and supporting materials by January 31, 1987 to:

Carol Turner, Chief, Jonsson Library of Government Documents,
Stanford University Libraries,
Stanford, California 94305.